University of Missouri-Saint Louis - MO

HLC ID 1472

OPEN PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review   Visit Date: 11/5/2018

Dr. Thomas F. George
President

Stephanie Brzuzy
HLC Liaison

Rex Ramsier
Review Team Chair

Lynette Olson
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Margaret Healy
Team Member

Andy Morgan
Team Member

Claudia Petrescu
Team Member

Jonathan Rosenthal
Team Member

Kimberly Rumford
Team Member

Barbara Tarter
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

11/5/2018
Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

- Federal Compliance 2018

Institutional Context

The University of Missouri - Saint Louis (UMSL) is a public land-grant institution serving approximately 17,000 students which includes about 8,000 degree seeking undergraduates, 6,000 dual credit high school students, and 3,000 graduate students. The diversity of the student body is a point of pride of the institution, and about three-fourths of the UMSL alumni reside in the St. Louis region and contribute to the local economy. UMSL has rebounded from financial stresses it experienced several years ago and has many new operational structures in place and continuous improvement activities underway. With a new strategic plan being operationalized and the leadership and momentum to achieve its goals, UMSL is well positioned to meet the challenges facing public higher education in the future.

Interactions with Constituencies

Open Forum Criteria 1 & 2: 16 participants including 3 faculty

Open Forum Criteria 3 & 4: 32 participants including 3 students, 10 faculty, and 10 staff

Open Forum Criterion 5: 11 participants including 1 student, 3 faculty, and 7 staff

Chair, University of Missouri Board of Curators

President, University of Missouri System

Alumni Board and Chancellor's Council Luncheon: 9 participants

Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; CFO

Business Manager, Facilities Management, Finance and Administration

Professor, College of Optometry

Associate Vice Provost, Student Administrative Service

Director III, Business Admin, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Director III, Business Admin, Finance and Administration

Vice Provost, Academic Affairs

E Desmond Lee Endowed Professor, Experiential & Family Education

Vice Provost, Student Affairs

Sr Student Support Specialist, Student Financial Aid

Associate Teaching Professor, Dept Chair, Military & Veterans Studies

Sr Program/Project Support Coordinator, Disability Access Services

Associate Professor, Theatre & Cinema Arts

Sr Human Resources Consultant, Human Resources

Dean, College of Optometry

Dean, College of Nursing

President, Student Government Association

Associate Provost, Student Success, Academic Affairs

Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management

Student Services Coordinator II, Registration

Business Manager, Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration

Director, Athletics

Dr. YS Tsiang Endowed Professor, Chinese Studies, Finance & Legal Studies

Chancellor, Professor, Chemistry/Biology and Physics/Astronomy

Director II, Student Support Services, Student Financial Aid

Professor, Department Chair, Physics and Astronomy

Associate Provost, Center for Teaching and Learning

Associate Professor, Department Chair, Communication & Media, Senate Chair

Associate Dean, Graduate School

Professor, Communication & Media; Special Assistant to the Provost

Executive Director, Human Resources

Administrative Consultant, Finance and Administration

Dean, College of Business Administration

Academic Director, Center for Teaching and Learning

Assistant Director, Student Support Services/Admissions

Director I Business Administration, College of Ed., Finance and Administration

Associate Teaching Professor, Sociology

Director I, Business Administration, College of Bus., Finance and Administration

Dean, School of Social Work

Dean, College of Arts & Sciences

Registrar, Registration

Sr Program Manager, Student Support Services, Student Administrative Service

Associate Vice Chancellor, University Development

Associate Teaching Professor, College of Nursing

Student Representative, Strategic Planning: Student Success Compact

Director I Student Support Services, Admissions

Director I Student Support Services, SUCCEED Program

Assistant Dean, College of Nursing

Director II Student Support Services, Student Involvement

Assistant Dean, College of Nursing

Professor, Department Chair, Information Systems

Professor, Department Chair, Accounting

Dean, Honors College

Adjunct Instructor, Family Medicine

Associate Professor, Pediatrics

Budget and Planning Committee, Professor of Chemistry/Biochemistry

Director I Business Administration, Finance and Administration

Dean, UMSL/Washington University UG Engineering

Instructional Designer-Expert, Center for Teaching and Learning

Associate Teaching Professor, Department Chair, Art and Design

Associate Professor, Communication & Media, Faculty Fellow, Academic Affairs

Professor, Department Chair, Political Science

Associate Professor, Art and Design

Student Representative, Strategic Planning: Research/Creative Works Compact

Compliance Manager, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Research Consultant II, Institutional Research

Business Manager, Student Affairs/Auxiliaries

Associate Provost Access and Academic Support, Student Academic Support

Police Captain, Institutional Safety-Police

Provost, Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Associate Professor, Educator Preparation and Leadership

Vice Provost, Office of Research Administration

Professor, Psychological Services

Associate Director, Office of Academic Integrity, Academic Affairs

Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry

Associate Professor, Accounting

Director I Student Support Services, Student Administrative Service

Dean, College of Education

Project Manager, Academic Affairs

Director I Finance, Accounting Services

Director II Business Administration, Finance and Administration

Chief Information Officer, ITS Operations

Director, Community Outreach & Engagement, Academic Affairs

Additional Documents

http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/fall_enroll_category.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/fall_enroll_degree_prog_level.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/fall_enroll_status.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/fall_enroll_history_table.pdf

 http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/ft_pt_employees_occupation.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/~ir/files/pdfs/degrees_faculty_highest.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/Senate%20and%20Assembly%20Archive/Agendas/2017-2018-agendas-minutes.html

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/committee%20members.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/facultycredentials.html

http://www.umsl.edu/continuinged/acp/Students%20and%20Parents/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/continuinged/acp/Faculty/acp_policies.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/NTT%20Promotion%20Guidelines%2003-13-17-senate%20approved%20Mar%202017wlinks.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/gradschool/faculty/gcminutes-jan2018.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/artscience/math_cs/about/People/Faculty/index.html

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/generaleducationrequirements/

https://www.umsl.edu/gradschool/admitted/graduatehandbook.html#Academic

https://www.umsl.edu/gradschool/admitted/graduatehandbook.html

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/artsandsciences/english/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/artsandsciences/english/#learningoutcomestext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/generaleducationrequirements/

https://www.umsl.edu/search.html

https://www.umsl.edu/

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/contact-us-index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/forms.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Technology%20Transfer/faqs.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Technology%20Transfer/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Animal%20Welfare%20Unit/index.html

OSP_PI_QUICK_GUIDE.pdf

Omb Uniform guidance.pptx

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Compliance/proposals-grants-contracts-compliance.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Compliance/animal-subjects-IACUC.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Compliance/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Proposals,%20Grants,%20and%20Contracts/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/About%20the%20ORA/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/

http://www.umsl.edu/a-z/index-r.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/about-us/staff.html

https://www.umsl.edu/search.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/committee%20members.html

https://www.umsl.edu/search.html

https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure

1804.pdf

1802.pdf

https://www.umsystem.edu/curators/minutes/

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/faqs.htmlhttp://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/h

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/

http://www.umsl.edu/services/finaid/scholarships/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/finaid/

http://www.umsl.edu/cashiers/tuition-fees/index.html

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/artsandsciences/biology/#graduatetext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/artsandsciences/biology/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/search/?search=physics

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/graduatestudy/#gradingtext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/graduatestudy/#coursepoliciestext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/graduatestudy/#enrollmenttext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/graduatestudy/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/coursesofinstruction/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/undergraduatestudy/#gradingtext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/undergraduatestudy/#courseworktext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/undergraduatestudy/#enrollmenttext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/coursesofinstruction/arths/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/undergraduatestudy/#graduationrequirementstext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/undergraduatestudy/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/artsandsciences/biology/#fouryearplanstext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/planofstudy/#artssciencestext

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/planofstudy/

http://bulletin.umsl.edu/

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/genedimp.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/faculty/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/officehours.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/sexualharrassment.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/course-evaluations.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/curriculum/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/grade-appeal.html

http://umsl.edu/budget/index.html#timeline

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/files/pdfs/committee%20listings-table%20format.pdf

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/University%20Assembly%20Membership/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/budget/

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/About%20the%20Senate/index.html

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/fa/audit

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/fa/finance-support-center/general_ledger

https://www.umsl.edu/services/ora/pdfs/funding-reports/fy2016-annual-report-external-awards.pdf

https://www.umsl.edu/now/about/tuition-fees.html

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/files/pdfs/senate-self-study-report-2016.pdf

https://www.umsl.edu/chancellor [and associated pages]

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/strategic-plan/index.html [and associated pages]

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/UMSL_Strategic_Plan_FINAL.pdf

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/review/index.html [and associated pages]

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/curriculum/index.html [and associated pages]

https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=MO&l=93+94&ct=1&id=178420

https://dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/app-action-items-report-5-7-18.pdf

https://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/umsl-program-prioritization-report-032218.pdf

https://irl.umsl.edu/do/search/?q=leadership%20concerns&start=0&context=8960249&facet

https://ire.udel.edu/cost/

https://academicanalytics.com/what-we-do/

https://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/Senate%20and%20Assembly%20Archive/Minutes/index.html

https://www.umsl.edu/budget/files/pdfs/20170519-BudgetPlanning.pdf

http://umsl.edu/budget/files/pdfs/UMSL%20Budget%20Proposal.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/budget/

https://www.umsystem.edu/about-us

https://board.um.umsystem.edu/September%202021%202018%20Board%20of%20Curators%20Meeting/Forms/AllIte
RootFolder=%2FSeptember%202021%202018%20Board%20of%20Curators%20Meeting%2F0%20Agenda&FolderC
{051202E9-7318-416F-9C1C-F36DB3C61BA8}

https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Clearinghouse/documents/Chapter%206%20-
%20Professional%20Advisor%20Load%20-%20FINAL.pdf

https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/2011-NACADA-National-Survey.aspx

https://www.umsystem.edu/media/ur/UMFacts.pdf?v=180507

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/fa/ir/enrollment-summary-report

https://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col_info_popup.asp?ID=178420

https://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/index.asp?
search=1&State=MO&zipcode=63042&miles=50&sortby=name&College=1&Records=1&CS=B1A170FC

https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?id=178420#enrolmt

https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?id=178420#retgrad

https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?id=178420#outcome

spreadsheets detailing faculty credentials

syllabi and other documents listed in the Federal Compliance Team Report

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

The University of Missouri (UM) System initiated a strategic planning process in spring 2017. The System then informed the four campuses of the timeline and five Compacts to be used in developing each campus' strategic plan. The initial draft of the plan was due to the System office by December 1, 2017, so UMSL had the 2017 fall semester to draft its plan. As part of the strategic planning process UMSL reviewed and modified its mission and vision statements. Five committees composed of faculty, staff and students developed outcomes and metrics for each of the five Compacts. Further revisions of the plan were completed during spring 2018. While drafting the initial plan and during the revision phase, there were open forums held on the campus to collect feedback from faculty, staff, and students. The UMSL five-year strategic plan with its revised mission and vision was approved by the Board of Curators on September 20, 2018.

In meetings with the Strategic Plan Steering Committee and the University Assembly Budget and Planning Committee it was confirmed that the groups described a series of open forums on the mission and Compacts as well as online feedback opportunities. Generally, the feedback was positive. Comments reinforced the use of "We transform lives" as the university tagline. Faculty and staff acknowledged that it was an intense process with a compressed timeline from the UM System, but that the plan predominantly reflects what UMSL has been doing and aligns well with the values of the campus.

The strategic plan is robust, broad, inclusive, and action focused. The 2018-2023 plan restates the mission and vision of the university with an emphasis on its role as a metropolitan, land grant, research university that serves the St. Louis metropolitan area. The faculty and staff affirmed their commitment to a broad group of diverse sub-populations such as first generation college students,

veterans, underrepresented students, parents, and adult students. Nearly three quarters of the new students are transfer students. The new mission continues UMSL's commitment to its role in serving a diverse population while acknowledging an interest in attracting students from the entire state of Missouri, Illinois, and international students. There is also an interest in increasing the number of first-time, full-time students.

The university has recently adopted a five-year budget planning model which is synchronized with its strategic plan. Faculty and staff see the new model as permitting the university to evaluate when and how it can fund new initiatives and expand current programs and services in support of the mission and the strategic plan. Finally, with the initiation of the NOW program the university is working to diversify the delivery of curriculum to meet needs of diverse and non-traditional students.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The mission is disseminated through UMSL foundational documents such as the University Bulletin, Campus Master Plan, and faculty and student handbooks. Each of these documents includes the mission. The 2018-2023 Strategic Plan is available on the website and articulates the vision, values, and an action plan for the five Compacts identified by the UM System. A search of the website found multiple locations where the mission was included as well as missions for departments that aligned with the university's mission.

The strategic plan includes five Compacts for excellence in Student Success, Research and Creative Works, Community Engagement and Economic Development, Inclusive Excellence, and Planning, Operations and Stewardship. In discussion of the goals and metrics of the Compacts, faculty, staff and students indicated that they were able to build on existing strengths such as their many community partnerships and the diversity of the student body. The Compacts also meant the university would continue its work to increase student retention and graduation rates as well as to develop external support for research and creative activity. In the pursuit of operational excellence many administrative support functions (e.g., Human Resources, Information Technology, and Finance) were being centralized either institutionally or at the System level. When appropriate, the university or the System is evaluating whether a private partnership would be beneficial.

The University clearly states its commitment to serve the St. Louis metropolitan area and its diverse student populations. For example, UMSL is working in partnership with the city to increase the percent of the adult population holding bachelor's degrees in the metro area to 40% by 2023. While the student body is diverse, the university needs to develop more support services, programs and infrastructure in order to retain and graduate diverse populations - this commitment is evident in the strategic plan. While the university is focused on the St. Louis metropolitan area, it understands the need to have a statewide impact. UMSL also plans to expand its reach into Illinois with a policy change that permits Illinois students to pay in-state rates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The UM System President, UMSL Chancellor and many faculty and staff identified the diversity of the student body as a distinguishing characteristic of UMSL. The definition of diversity is very inclusive and reflects a commitment to students from underrepresented populations, first-generation college students, transfers, veterans, disabled students, LGBTQ students, students who are parents, students who are in the workforce, and dual enrolled high school students. The university reaches out to these sub-populations with programs and support tailored to each group's needs. The commitment can be seen in the data analysis of their student body where they examine grade point average, retention, transfer out and graduation rates for most sub-populations. Once UMSL understands how students are progressing, it develops initiatives to improve performance on these metrics.

The strategic plan has a Compact for Inclusive Excellence which establishes goals to continue to support diverse students. The Compact was developed with an understanding of the diversity of the student body and reflects the university's intent to construct an infrastructure of programs and services that support student success. In 2016 the UM System received a report from the IBIS Consulting Group on Diversity Inclusion and Equity on the four campuses. The goals outlined in the Compact respond to some of the recommendations included in the UM System IBIS Consulting Group report and the UMSL Rankin Climate Study.

Multicultural Student Services provides a number of opportunities to support academic and personal challenges through workshops, programming and one on one academic coaching. Organizations such as MOCHA (Men of Color, Honor and Ambition), PRIZM (Queer-Trans-Straight Alliance), Black Graduate Student Association, and Chinese Students and Scholars Association all provide support services for students from diverse backgrounds. Peer mentoring, staff mentoring, and faculty mentoring provide opportunities for all students to excel through one on one student support. With the goal to expand multicultural student services, there is obviously an opportunity for recruiting and retaining a growing diverse student body. In an effort to increase the number of diverse faculty and staff, there is an opportunity for UMSL to grow their own through their students and alumni.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The University Bulletin institutional history states "The University of Missouri St. Louis is the metropolitan, land-grant, research institution serving the most diverse and economically important region in Missouri." This commitment to the St. Louis metropolitan area is echoed in the mission statement and in the strategic plan. Through discussions with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, alumni and community partners, it is apparent that this commitment is carried out through partnerships with corporations, non-profits, community agencies, and K-12 schools. Partners offered examples of collaborative efforts for grants, research and other projects, internships and other learning opportunities for students, as well as a willingness to hire UMSL students and graduates. It was apparent from the partners the team met that UMSL was seen as providing valuable resources to the community.

The Assurance Argument identifies a significant number of community partnerships that are mutually beneficial to the community and the university. The Greater St. Louis Chamber has established a goal to increase the number of degree holding adults in the community - UMSL is their partner and has responded with NOW, offering degree programs at night, online, and during the weekend.

The university supports 37 Endowed Professors who are critical leaders for community partnerships. Endowed professors submit an annual report on their work that includes the service they have provided. Through their work they have partnerships within the community that support mutual goals and interests. Initiatives include research, partnerships with schools, service to the community, and programs for community members.

The Strategic Plan includes a Compact for Excellence in Community Engagement and Economic Development. The outcomes and metrics for this Compact build on the work of existing community partnerships. The discussion with faculty and staff about community engagement suggests that the university identified a need to inventory the existing partnerships and their outcomes in order to establish a baseline for the work that they will do to increase their engagement with the St. Louis community.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

The Assurance Argument is well-written and addresses Criterion 1 and its Core Components comprehensively, and coupled with on-site interviews there is substantial evidence that UMSL meets all expectations of Criterion 1.

The Team suggests that UMSL: define metrics that measure desired outcomes as it further develops infrastructure to support diversity; ensure that assessment plans for the NOW offerings verify that targeted student sub-populations are well served; and move forward quickly with the Inclusive Excellence strategies to engage diverse faculty and staff.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL operates with integrity in the areas of finance, academics, personnel and auxiliary systems. The institution benefits from its affiliation with the UM System in that many processes and policies are standardized across member campuses. The UM System to which UMSL makes annual financial filings (see also Core Component 5) is independently audited annually. Internal Audit reports directly to the Board of Curators, which also has a separate Audit Committee. Review of websites indicates that fiscal policy and procedures are extensively documented as part of the System in policy manuals and the Code of Ethics.

Many on-campus interviews indicated a high degree of transparency in communication and understanding of budgetary process and prioritization, as well as in short- and long-term planning and budgeting. Many reported a high degree of collaboration between UMSL senior leadership and the Budget and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate and University Assembly. Budget managers report that they are a bridge between senior administration and deans and department chairs. A "trello board" serves as a shared forum for ideas. These ideas are analyzed by business managers. An idea approved by the business manager, CFO and dean can lead to major funding requests and launching of new initiatives. This encourages cooperation among units, including central administration/CFO.

Responding to declines in enrollment and state support, the UM system and UMSL engaged in a budget review and prioritization process beginning in April 2017. As verified by the published timeline and discussions during the site visit, the process was open and transparent. The FY18 Budget Planning Target Summary memo of May 30, 2017 lists UMSL's specific revenue goals, cost increases and strategic cuts and investments, reflecting the outcomes of the Academic Program Prioritization (APP) process. The Team verified with senior leadership that teach-out plans were in place for all suspended programs.

The Academic Affairs website contains the expected policies and procedures such as academic dishonesty, accreditation, curriculum (including the ongoing Curriculum Alignment Process), grade appeals, and sexual harassment. As part of the 18-19 University Bulletin, the Code of Student

Conduct and Title IX policies and procedures are fully enumerated, including due process in appeals.

The UM system compiles Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR) centrally as they apply to faculty and staff. Statements on ethical expectations, filing grievances and the resulting processes - including multi-layered appeals - are complete and fully documented. Policies on tenure and promotion are clear. Conversations with staff and faculty indicate that all of these policies are well understood. In addition, discussions during the visit indicated that auxiliary units are self-sufficient and that contracts with external vendors followed established procurement policies. Finally, FAQ pages provide clear and understandable guidance on appropriate legal and compliance processes, including how to register concerns. A telephone hotline and website are also available.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

All evidence suggests that UMSL is accurate and transparent. For example: the federally required Student Consumer Information is complete and the website is linked from the homepage A-Z index; HLC and all specialized accreditations are listed in the factbook and on appropriate university and unit websites; tuition and fees are clearly presented online; the financial aid site is detailed and well-organized; and bill payment information is clear and easy to understand.

The University Bulletin makes graduation requirements clear, including the "Missouri Core 42" (for transfers), UMSL's general education program, major, and other requirements. The sample four-year undergraduate plans provide a clear roadmap for students, indicating a commitment to making requirements transparent as part of UMSL's student success strategies. Graduate plans are clear and graduate-specific policies are noted. Other expected sections such as FERPA and academic integrity are included. The Bulletin is easy to navigate and is, in many ways, a model for other campuses.

The university is strongly anchored in the St. Louis community. Its Chancellor is past president of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities. Thirty-seven endowed professorships engage in community work as part of their appointment. For example, a biology faculty who holds an endowed position has partnerships with the Zoo and the Botanical Garden. To ensure that the endowed professorships' requirements for community engagement is met, a review of these activities is performed at the Provost's level annually.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The Board of Curators oversees all UM System institutions. CRR 10.030 outlines the Board's structure, authority, and responsibilities, as well as duties of Curators. Authority is consistent with general practice, including appointment and review of the President, broad policy on faculty appointments, approval of the annual budget, tuition, and fees, and major academic and facility initiatives. Standing committees of the Board are consistent with its major functions, including, for example, Academic, Student Affairs, Research and Economic Development, Audit, Finance, External Affairs, and Marketing and Advancement.

Board meetings are announced and open to the public. Board minutes and meeting documents are available publicly and demonstrate appropriate oversight and level of engagement. For example, the April 2018 minutes direct individual campuses to develop application and review processes related to a faculty leave policy established by the Board. December 2016 minutes indicate approval of a new doctoral program at UMSL. In order to avoid undue influence and conflict of interest, Curators file a personal financial disclosure statement with the Missouri Ethics Commission as well as an annual conflict of interest form as outlined in CRR 10.030 B.2.f.

There is evidence that, despite enrollment and budget pressures, the Board acts in the interest of the internal and external constituencies of UMSL. For example, responding to a student referendum, in 2012 the Board approved debt financing for the Recreation and Wellness Center. In addition, in the interest of the university and surrounding community, the Board approved construction of a new optometry and nursing building, including an optometry clinic, supporting the outreach mission of the College of Optometry. Conversation with the Chair of the Board indicated that the Board is proud of the role that UMSL plays in its urban environment, serving as an anchor institution to a diverse population in the St. Louis region. The Board is also proud of the way UMSL has responded to its previous financial challenges, and of the collaborative and forward-looking approach being taken by UMSL within the UM System.

Minutes of the Faculty Senate indicate that faculty set and approve curriculum as well as any changes to academic policies. The Senate's comprehensive 2016-17 five-year review summarizes the Curriculum and Instruction Committee's review of program and course proposals and various policy changes such as Math and English proficiency and general education. Overall, many on-campus conversations confirmed that shared governance through the Faculty Senate and University Assembly is robust. As a result of Senate's recent program review and EAB analysis, discussions are underway to consolidate the 24 current Senate subcommittees.

The Board delegates day-to-day operations to the System President. Chancellors and senior administrators provide leadership on their campuses as outlined in CRR 10.030 Article IV. Conversations with the System President, Chancellor, and Provost during the visit indicated appropriate levels of engagement, system-level guidance, and campus autonomy. For example, the Faculty Senate and administration redefined the relationship of the graduate school and research office and merged the College of Fine Arts and Communication with the College of Arts and Sciences as described in the Senate 2016 self-study report.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

CRR 310.010, "Academic Freedom and Economic Security of Academic Staff" outlines the principles of academic freedom and tenure for the UM System. The principles for academic freedom are consistent with AAUP recommendations. UMSL has well-considered policies as evidenced by the Free Speech Guidelines; a Statement on Freedom of Expression approved by the Faculty Senate, Student Government and the Staff Association; and guidelines for the use of outdoor spaces. Sample civility statements are provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning. During the site visit, the Team experienced open and forthcoming interviews and discussions, and no indications that any issues exist at UMSL with respect to freedom of expression or truth in teaching and learning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL's Office of Research Administration (ORA) is charged with oversight of all faculty, staff and student research. ORA's website is exhaustive, referencing policies and procedures related to: IACUC review; biosafety; conflict of interest; export controls; and IRB (using IRBNet). The grants and contracts site references appropriate OMB uniform guidelines as well as UM System polices and audit requirements. There is a "quick guide" for principal investigators created by ORA that reflects OMB's Uniform Guidance as well as a PowerPoint from the System office that outlines specific concerns for Missouri universities. Forms related to compliance and internal/external grants are readily downloadable. Faculty interviewed on-site report satisfaction with the IRB process as well as grant support both pre- and post-award.

On the student side, to ensure ethical conduct of research, all undergraduate and graduate students engaged in research are required to take a research ethics course. ORA regularly sends out a list of students who have to take the ethical conduct courses prior to engaging in research. Overall, ORA provides very complete guidance and appropriate oversight.

Students are offered guidance on the use of sources in the University Bulletin (Standard of Student Conduct) and Student Handbook. Students are expected to comply with UMSL's network and acceptable use policies. The library has a user-friendly website introducing citation managers and various resources. UMSL uses Turnitin to enforce academic integrity with sanctioning authority retained in Academic Affairs. Campus discussion indicated that Turnitin is used developmentally and that information on academic integrity is part of first-year coursework and the general education program.

CR 200.010, Standard of Conduct, outlines policies and expectations related to ethical conduct generally, including: academic dishonesty; appropriate use of computing resources; disruptive behavior; hazing; and harassment. UMSL posts a recently updated document on academic dishonesty that includes student and faculty obligations, as well as detailed hearing and appeal processes. Of note is that there is a designated Office of Academic Integrity (OAI). Twenty-eight cases of academic misconduct were reported in FY 18 with 23 resulting in some sort of sanction.

Faculty and staff research is governed by CRR 420.010 and CRR 420.030, covering research

misconduct and conflict of interest, respectively. Sanctions up to and including revocation of tenure reside with the faculty. Site-visit discussions with representatives of the faculty and ORA indicated that appropriate processes were followed and appropriate sanctions were taken in the very few instances of research misconduct. It is clear that the university takes such situations very seriously. The Faculty Senate has a committee whose task is to review faculty and staff misconduct and provide recommendations. Due to lack of such situations, this committee has gained the name "Sleeping Dragon."

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

Review of System-wide resources and UMSL policies, procedures, and websites, as well as on-site discussions, confirm that UMSL has strong protections to ensure integrity in academics, budget and planning, and personnel matters. Academic freedom and civil discourse are encouraged through policy and example. The university makes its course and program offerings, academic policies, tuition and fees, and billing practices clear to its students and the public. The consumer guide and University Bulletin are exceptionally well-done and informative. There is a very strong culture of shared governance and common purpose that contributes to good communication among faculty, staff and administration and to transparency in processes. Overall, the institution acts with integrity and meets the expectations of Criterion 2.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL has courses and programs that are responsive to students' and employers' needs. The Faculty Senate has approved close to 300 program changes between 2014 and 2017 as part of the UMSL assessment and continuous improvement process. In response to changing demand, the institution has placed an added focus on such programs as Criminology, Mental Health, Cyber Security, and a doctorate degree in Business Administration. Further evidence of UMSL's responsiveness to student needs is found in the Night, Online and Weekend Programs (NOW), which partners several bachelor programs with local community colleges. In addition, certificate programs such as health communication, technical writing, and gender and the military have also been added. These programs should both serve the community and provide opportunities for additional recruitment opportunities for the four-year programs.

The institution is currently undergoing a Curriculum Alignment Process (CAP) to establish streamlined degree pathways aligned to institutional outcomes. This process has been effective in keeping academic advisors updated on student requirements at both the first-time freshman and new transfer student levels. The use of CAP will allow UMSL to actively monitor student progress and to use these data to increase retention and ultimately graduation rates.

Undergraduate and graduate academic programs are reviewed every five years. In addition, graduate programs are reviewed by the Graduate Council to ensure that they are rigorous and require the level of performance suitable to a graduate degree. Each area that offers a graduate program also has a designated program director, who is responsible for oversight in this area. Learning outcomes are published in the University Bulletin for all academic programs and reflect faculty consensus on the

knowledge and skills students must achieve based on disciplinary norms.

In response to the undergraduate and graduate program evaluations, programs such as Fine Arts and Communication have merged with the College of Arts and Sciences. From this merger, a School of Performing Arts has formed, reporting to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Other programs such as Industrial Organizational Psychology, Theater and Art History are being phased out. Faculty will continue to teach out any students remaining in these programs and will then be assigned to other areas.

UMSL's Advanced Credit Program allows high school students to earn UMSL class credit. The high school instructors are mentored by UMSL faculty liaisons, who review syllabi, course objectives, textbooks, and assessments for every course. These reviews make sure the course requirements are equivalent to on-campus courses and provide the off-campus instructor with opportunities for professional development and faculty mentoring.

In addition, full-time faculty from the main campus often teach at the additional locations and the HLC concluded in its 2016 Multi-Location Visit Report that the off-campus program is "efficiently run and effectively managed." UMSL's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery, including on-campus, off-campus and online. Site Directors and advisors at off-campus sites attend regular meetings on the main campus, allowing them to be aware of any changes or new programs that are being offered. They also attend orientation sessions on the main campus.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL prides itself on transforming lives and meeting the higher education needs of the St. Louis region. The campus offers a diverse number of educational offerings, as required by Missouri state guidelines, but also those approved by Faculty Senate. The UMSL Core and Explore provides a foundation of classes that undergraduate students must take. General education courses include a broad range of required courses in core areas such as Writing, Mathematics, Communication, and Information Literacy, but also in UMSL's Explore areas of Humanities and Fine Arts, Social Sciences, and Mathematics and Life/Natural Sciences.

Students who have less than 24 credits are required to take a first year experience course, which introduces students to Career Services and other essential services. Students have many opportunities for internships with the Express Scripts headquarters, which is located on the UMSL campus. Additionally, teacher education students are able to observe, intern, and student teach in the region's public K-12 schools. Finally, other hands-on experiences such as research, study abroad, and cooperative education provide additional opportunities for students to develop skills and apply their classroom learning. UMSL engages students through their academic courses with the St. Louis community with the help of alumni, Career Services, and academic departments.

UMSL's mission focuses on culture, diversity, and inclusion. The campus offers and promotes diversity initiatives through a variety of departments, student organizations, and campus wide programs. Within UMSL's general education requirements there is a focus on Cultural Diversity with

a variety of course offerings to expand cultural awareness. Several administrators, including the Chancellor, indicated the need to recruit more Hispanic students by providing more recruitment materials in Spanish, including on web pages.

With over 120 student organizations, UMSL offers a variety of inclusive activities. The institution provides Safe Zone training for LGBTQ, Green Zone training for faculty and staff regarding the needs of Veterans, current Service members and their families, and a variety of diverse groups such as an International student club, a Black Business Association, and a Hispanic Latino Association. UMSL offers an average of eight diversity events per cultural history and celebration month. In addition to ethnic diversity, there are a number of opportunities for learning leadership skills such as the Women's Leadership Institute, a Leadership Discovery Summit, Advanced Leaders, and Emerging Leaders. Finally, within the strategic plan there are goals to increase diversity and better serve the underrepresented student population, such as reinvigorating the African/African American Studies program and establishing a multicultural student center.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The Fall 2017 UM System data indicate that UMSL had 443 full-time faculty, with 75% holding the highest academic degree in their discipline, and 419 part-time faculty. Of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, 1.2 % are Hispanic (3); 0.4% are American Indian (1); 14.9% are Asian (37); 7.7% are Black (19); 0.8% are Pacific Islanders (2), and 70.2% are White (174). In addition, 3.2% are nonresident aliens (8) and 1.6% are other (4).

A total of 16,715 students were registered in the Fall of 2017. Of these, 15,992 provided demographic data. The student demographics represent a Hispanic population of 3.2% (512); an Asian population of 5% (792); a Black population of 14.5% (2,316); an American Indian population of 0.3% (55); a Pacific Islander population of .09% (14); a White Population of 72% (11,510); and a population made up of two or more races of 1.9% (300).

The institution will need to continue to consider diversity as it hires new faculty. In an effort to mirror the current student body of 14.4% black students, the current black faculty population of 7.7% represents only slightly half of this group. The institution is aware of this concern but faces the same constraints as other institutions attempting to hire top qualified minorities for faculty positions. The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion ensures that employment searches attract the most diverse and qualified candidate pool possible.

The policy for credentialing the faculty teaching in the Advanced Credit Program (ACP) are

consistent with the on-campus credentialing of faculty; they must have at least a master's degree in the discipline or at least 18 hours in the content area. The ACP program is also accredited by the National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP).

New faculty are expected to attend an orientation program that introduces campus services, support, activities, and research funding opportunities. All faculty are evaluated annually and these reports are reviewed by the department or unit chair. The chair then completes a summary score sheet for each faculty. The chair ranks faculty performance in the areas of instruction, advising, research and service. These scores are then used toward tenure and the post-tenure review process. All endowed professors also have a required annual review.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides methods for improving and sustaining teaching through the sharing of best practices, guidance on the essential elements of a course syllabus, and providing special speakers and training workshops. Instructors who wish to develop an online course must go through an Online in 9 program, held by the CTL. The "Ten Steps to Success" program provides instructors with professional development experiences including such areas as Digital Fluency, Service Learning, Course Design, and Classroom Observation.

Faculty are encouraged to participate in research. The President of the System has indicated that there is a need to significantly increase the research portfolio at UMSL. To this end, collaboration is being encouraged throughout the System with an effort to connect researchers between campuses and to increase faculty mentoring. In addition, ORA recently piloted a program called the Early Career Research Network to help junior faculty be successful in research and grant-writing activities. Finally, the success of faculty proposals with the help of one grant writer has resulted in an additional grant writer being hired. Grant activities have expanded from NSF toward other funding sources such as DOD, where the campus has been very successful.

Staff members providing student support services are well-qualified and a variety of training tools and opportunities are available. UMSL uses a Unified Advising Record (Starfish), and a Degree Audit and Degree Mapper program. Each of these tools provides a streamlined method of effectively and efficiently advising students. Each college is assigned a professional career counselor who works with the applicable students until they have declared a specific major or met certain requirements. This counselor also handles any issues revealed through a survey provided to new students in the sixth week of the semester. If the issue is not academic, the student is referred to appropriate support services.

The 2011 National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) indicates that the average advising load for college, school and division advisors, for medium size universities 6,000 to 23,999 (n=80) is 345 students. Meetings with the academic retention group indicate that UMSL career counselors' caseload may in some cases be greater than this, and the institution might wish to review advising loads going forward.

Finally, students and alumni working in the Tutoring Center are provided with twelve hours of tutor training, and campus-wide tutor training is now offered. Online academic tutoring is currently being planned to better serve the diverse UMSL student body. Data indicate that 85% of students who participated in at least five hours of tutoring per week earned grades of C+ or better in their classes, so this is clearly an effective way to improve retention and graduation rates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL recently appointed an Associate Provost for Student Success, an Assistant Provost for Access and Academic Support, and opened a University Tutoring Center. These areas work closely together and the staff indicated they provide a "warm hand-off" to other offices on campus to meet students' needs. Multicultural Student Services provides a variety of academic mentoring programs and workshops to meet the academic needs of the diverse student body.

The campus has plans to hire an Early Alert Coordinator to provide additional student outreach to students, and to educate faculty and staff about campus services. There will be an opportunity for this new position to collaborate with the CARE Team and other student success initiatives. Additionally, the institution provides other student support services well-suited to the needs of UMSL students. For example, within the Veterans Center, the campus offers Green Zone Training to help develop a supportive campus community for Veterans, current Service members, and their families.

Student Services assists highly vulnerable students with securing public assistance, housing, and food. The Triton Hunger Relief Fund, mobile food pantries, and a soon-to-be developed permanent food pantry, are just a few ways that UMSL has provided hunger relief on its campus. Within the new strategic plan, there is a goal to implement a multicultural student center that will become the framework for programming and support by 2019-20 academic year. Additionally, the campus recently received grant funding to assist students with child daycare costs.

UMSL runs a successful bridge program that introduces middle and high school students, and their parents, to college processes. The program provides special attention to pre-college experiences that will acclimate the students to the college environment, while providing academic enrichment, ACT preparation, career guidance and scholarship opportunities. The initial bridge program was started

thirty+ years ago and served approximately 50 summer students and 120 Saturday students. Today, the bridge program serves close to 4,000 students. Fifty-six percent of seniors that attend the bridge program matriculate to UMSL.

Finally, the UMSL campus is well maintained with updated facilities and offers a variety of academic, performing arts, and recently renovated laboratory spaces. There is a capital budget plan that looks five years out for major projects, which as mentioned elsewhere is also synchronized with the five-year strategic plan. Two members of the Team toured the campus, which is comprised of 470 acres of what used to be a country club. The environment is conducive to learning with large expanses of green space, which might be an asset in future marketing campaigns as UMSL tries to move toward a more residential campus image.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL's short version of its mission is "We Transform Lives". Consistent with this, the Office of Student Involvement offers a wide range of co-curricular activities that support academic learning, civic engagement and community service. These experiences include the ability to participate in: St. Louis Public Radio (90.7 KWMU); thirteen Division II level sports; the Chancellor's Engaged Leadership program; leadership conferences such as the Women's Leadership Institute; MLK Day of Service; Trunk-or-Treat; The Big Event!; and over 100 student organizations. Considering the campus' large transfer enrollment (75% of the new fall class) and off-campus (commuter) student population, challenges in promoting on-campus involvement exist. However there is a campus goal, as emphasized by the President and Chancellor, to increase the first-time freshman population.

With a part-time undergraduate enrollment of 60% and a part-time graduate enrollment of 65%, the institution recognizes the commuter nature of its students. Relying largely on the success of transfer enrollments to-date, there is a need to increase the number of students who enter the university as first-time, full-time freshmen. Currently, there are about 1,400 beds on campus, but they are only at 75% occupancy. There is a desire to increase the number of beds to 2,400 in addition to creating housing scholarships to increase occupancy. Growth of the traditional new student population creates an opportunity for student affairs departments, specifically Residential Life & Housing, Student Involvement, Service Programs, and Fraternity & Sorority Life, to promote and expand their services.

Students are provided internship opportunities that focus on real world experience, such as the College of Business' Academic Internship Programs, and Communications and Media's practicum and internships. It was noted by many on campus the variety of internship opportunities available at Express Scripts. In addition, more than 72% of the 100,000 UMSL alumni choose to live and work in the St. Louis area. This has provided an excellent opportunity for internships, service learning, alumni mentors, and recruitment opportunities. In 2010, the university won the Carnegie Engaged Campus classification for demonstrating a strong and persistent commitment to engagement. Engagement will need to be a continued focus to maintain strong community relationships.

The 2018-2023 Strategic Plan indicates a number of goals that are directly related to student research, community engagement, and service learning. These include centralizing and coordinating

undergraduate research opportunities within the ORA by 2022, expanding Living Learning Communities by 2019, and increasing the number of internships available to students by 20% or from 767 to 920. With respect to student community engagement, there is a desire to integrate a co-curricular student involvement tracking system by 2021 which would track volunteerism and service. In addition, there are goals to increase the number of service-learning courses and implement the use of community engagement sections within the MyVita system for faculty.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Based on a review of the available evidence, combined with interviews and discussion on-site, it is clear that UMSL serves the needs of its diverse students by providing a quality education and comprehensive support services. Therefore, UMSL meets the expectations of Criterion 3.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL has a robust five-year cycle of program review for academic and non-academic units and centers. The process involves a self-study at the unit level using consistent templates, a review and written report from both an internal committee and an external evaluator, and an opportunity for a written response to the reviews by the unit. All of the templates, reports and responses are available on the Institutional Research (IR) site and provide substantial evidence of a best-practices model of program review. The templates are currently being revised based on lessons learned in order to allow academic programs which have external accreditation/licensure to use that information more directly during program review, and to also better accommodate non-academic units whose mission and function differ from those of their academic counterparts.

Although a regular cycle of program review is required by the UM System, it is clear from written documentation and from numerous campus interviews that program review is an integral part of the culture at UMSL. In addition to academic programs, even units such as the Faculty Senate undergo program review, and evidence was presented that the last review has initiated a reconsideration of the committee structure of the Faculty Senate to improve efficiency and optimize the use of faculty time. For academic units in particular, assessment of learning is a core component of program review, and evidence indicates that the results of major field tests, capstone courses, and other culminating programmatic activities are tracked and analyzed.

In 2017-2018, the Academic Program Prioritization (APP) process centered on Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) data on low productivity programs, and used data collected for program review. UMSL is a data-driven institution, and also uses data from the Delaware Cost Study, Academic Analytics, and Educational Advisory Board to inform its decision making. There is well-documented evidence which describes how APP led to program closures (with appropriate teach-out plans) in certain low priority/non-strategic areas, and investments in strategic areas. Areas of disinvestment include the BA in Theatre Arts, the Masters in Music Education, and the MA/PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, whereas investments are being made in Social Work, Cybersecurity, Clinical Psychology and Graphic Design.

The Curriculum Alignment Process (CAP) which also began in 2017-2018 is aimed at improving consistency, streamlining degrees and leading to curricular maps and schedules of offering for efficient degree completion. Evidence indicates that this process is engaging the faculty and advisors and involves the articulation of essential learning outcomes and culling of electives. CAP will also centralize an annual review process for all academic units to strengthen the assessment of student learning and contribute in a more substantial and consistent manner to the five-year program review process, which, as noted above, is already robust.

With respect to control of the curriculum, each college has its own curriculum committee and there is a Curriculum and Instruction Committee of the Faculty Senate which must approve all curricular changes. Changes at the program level also need UM System and State level authorization. UMSL follows standard credit hour assignments and semester lengths as evidenced by the review completed for federal compliance by the site-visit Team. In addition, standard CLEP, ACE, AP, placement testing, etc. policies are all published, as are transfer guides and the statewide CORE 42 (general education) program. UMSL has a substantial number (about 6,000) of Advanced Credit Program (dual enrollment) students in high schools. This program is accredited by NACEP and reviews of the faculty credentials (primarily high school teachers) provide evidence that they meet HLC expectations for graduate level training in the disciplines in which they teach.

Finally, the Center for Teaching and Learning is a resource for faculty development, and student support is provided via many avenues such as the Math Academic Center, Writing Center, online tutors, peer mentoring, supplemental instruction, and the new University Tutoring Center. Interviews provided additional evidence that the new strategic plan involves developing more infrastructure, programming and student support targeted at underrepresented populations, which indicates that UMSL is not only proud of its diversity but is seeking ways to improve the success of these students.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UMSL annual assessment processes which are currently decentralized and feed into the five-year program review will become centralized under the CAP model described above. This move will further strengthen both the assessment and program review processes at the institution. UMSL has defined seven overarching learning outcomes: critical thinking; creative thinking; communication; diversity; information literacy; integrative thinking; and quantitative analysis. Many websites, all syllabi, and the bulletin list and describe student learning outcomes which communicate the importance of assessment to students and provide evidence that a culture of assessment permeates the campus.

Assessment strategies at UMSL vary but are well-tailored to the academic disciplines. Portfolios, capstone courses, major field exams, etc. are all methods of direct assessment being employed, and evidence exists that subsequent curricular and programmatic changes are resulting from the findings. Experiential learning such as internships and externships are also part of the assessment used in certain disciplines. UMSL uses NSSE for freshmen and seniors every year which contributes to indirect assessment, and based on data from comparable peer groups, recent gains have been made in students engaging with diversity but not in collaborative learning. Finally, evidence indicates that academic programs with external accreditation are fulfilling the expectations of their respective disciplines with respect to student learning and post-graduation success.

The general education program at UMSL is part of the new Missouri Core 42, a statewide program of 42 credits comprised of three credits each of math, writing, communication, information literacy, and U.S. history and government, and nine credits each of humanities and fine arts, math and science, and social science. Some of these areas (e.g. Math and English) have been analyzed from an assessment standpoint where data indicated achievement gaps and barriers to student success in subsequent courses. These analyses led to policy modifications which now require certain courses to be completed within a students' first year with a C- or better, resulting in demonstrable improvements in student success metrics. In addition, other areas involved in general education have seen dramatic

reductions in the number of students receiving D and F grades, or withdrawing, through the implementation of the Supplemental Instruction (SI) program. These examples of actions based on data-driven assessment provide substantial evidence that UMSL uses information on student learning for continuous improvement.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Fall 2018 enrollment numbers indicated that 6,009 students were dual-credit high school students. This group presents its own challenges to the university but also provides a tremendous opportunity for recruiting first-time, full-time freshmen. Only 485 first-time, full-time students enrolled at the university in the fall of 2018; a little over 8% of the total dual credit students enrolled. If the institution is to increase this population, it might look for additional ways of meeting the needs of these students and marketing the benefits of UMSL to them.

From Fall 2013 until the Fall of 2018, transfer enrollment from the biggest feeder Community College, St. Louis Community College, to UMSL dropped from 637 students to 496, or down 141 (22%) students from just this source. Total transfer enrollment from community colleges to UMSL dropped from 986 to 807 during this same time frame, or down 179 (18%) students. Transfer students have different needs than traditional freshmen as they often have families, multiple jobs, and parents that they are supporting. UMSL has addressed some of these needs with programs such as Tiny Tritons, parent cafes, family friendly athletic events, and by providing childcare. A review of the yield on transfer enrollments for fall 2018 is 3,207 students applied with a yield of 71% (1,516), which is greater than the system average of 66%.

A review of fall 2018 capture rates from first-time, full-time freshmen who applied to UMSL (3,595) indicate a 27% yield rate (500); the system average is at 32%. Given the small first-time freshman population and the diversity of services offered, it would seem that this group should be retained at a very high rate. Yet, UMSL is currently losing 34% of its full-time, first-time freshmen to other institutions. Close to two-thirds of part-time, first-time freshmen are lost to other institutions

(62%). Full-time transfer students are lost at the rate of 24% and part-time transfer students are lost at the rate of 37%. These data clearly indicate the challenges of both recruitment and retention, and verify discussions on-site that UMSL is often not the first choice of where to attend for students who apply.

With these data as context, UMSL has a very diverse student body and collects and analyzes substantial amounts of data to inform its decision making. With respect to student success, the institution provides significant evidence of tracking of retention, persistence and graduation rates sliced categorically by ethnicity, Pell eligibility, transfer vs. first-time, part-time vs. full-time, etc. Analyses have even been performed which determine the cost of attrition to UMSL for negative service indicators (both academic and financial). Numerical metrics for retention and graduation rates are explicitly incorporated in the current strategic plan, and numerous interviews at various levels of the institution indicate that recent progress has been made but also that the future goals of further improvement are achievable.

UMSL has recently adopted a unified advising record using the platform Starfish, and central coordination of college advisors and retention specialists has been implemented. Under the new centralized scheme led by a new position in the Office of the Provost, consistent policies, procedures and professional development activities are now in place. These initiatives are a result of analyses of student retention rates noted above and demonstrate a proactive approach to continuous improvement and the ability of UMSL to act on lessons learned.

Finally, the UM System recognizes the need for and the challenges of improving retention, persistence and graduation rates across its four institutions. As part of strategic planning at the system-level, 100M$ will be available to fund competitive proposals for student scholarships. Three fourths of these monies will be need-based, to assist Pell-eligible and near-Pell students, as it is often the case that financial constraints limit student success. UMSL has a large population of students who could potentially benefit from this new initiative. UMSL has also recently received a 550k$ grant for child care from the U.S. Department of Education which will contribute to the success of its non-traditional students who pursue their education while raising their families.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

The UMSL Assurance Argument, additional documents and websites reviewed, and on-campus interviews all provide sufficient evidence that the institution has robust program review and assessment processes, utilizes data from multiple sources and perspectives to inform its planning and implementation, and focuses on continually improving its students' success. All of these activities demonstrate that UMSL takes responsibility for its offerings and therefore that the institution meets Criterion 4.

UMSL is encouraged to pursue new mechanisms to improve in the area of collaborative learning as reflected in NSSE findings and to also expand its assessment activities in non-academic areas as it implements its new strategic plan.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met

Evidence

As indicated in the Assurance Argument, UMSL experienced a downward decline in revenue from 2012 through 2015 culminating in a CFI ratio "in the zone" in 2015. As also documented in the submitted materials and verified through on-site interviews, UMSL took corrective action. Immediate measures in 2016 included eliminating positions, reducing budgets, and a hiring freeze.

Additional longer term measures were subsequently implemented. The budget model was adjusted to reduce discretionary funding in the colleges and redirect vacancy savings and carry-over funds centrally to provide opportunities for investing in the overall needs of the university. Interviews consistently indicate that the changes were vetted through extensive shared governance with participation from affected constituencies.

Based on evidence included in the Assurance Argument, the UMSL website, and on-site interviews, the Budget and Planning Committee serves in an advisory capacity for the majority of budgetary decisions. The Budget and Planning Committee members indicated that they felt that their advice was taken seriously by administration and their requests for more information were honored. For example, the budget reductions in 2015/2016 were brought before the Budget and Planning committee. Initially, they did not feel that they received enough information so in an executive session

were provided with data sufficient to move along without violating privacy. Once they endorsed a proposal, it went forward to the University Assembly. Per interviews and documentation reviewed during the site-visit team's work, programmatic and operational changes along with a new budget model allowed UMSL to recover from its financial challenges and regain control over its finances to enable investments in areas of opportunity.

Enrollment at UMSL has been declining and shifting from full-time to part-time students. This trend continued in Fall 2018. Per documentation provided and interviews, UMSL identified an opportunity to increase enrollment from Illinois students by expanding the area eligible for in-state tuition. According to interviews, the number of additional students UMSL needed to break even upon extending its in-state tuition was 20 students. This number was exceeded resulting in positive net revenue and an offset to the enrollment decline for this semester.

According to Missouri state websites and verified through interviews, state appropriations are generally made directly to the UM System which then allocates funds to its institutions. However, the state may elect to make some directed allocations to individual campuses. Interviews indicate that UMSL had state appropriation increases over the course of several years as an equity adjustment totaling approximately $9.5M. This increased their percentage of the total system allocation from 13% to almost 14%.

With respect to funding opportunities, UMSL may have the opportunity to obtain additional funding through the formula funding metrics. The CFO indicated that they have not been reviewing the metrics for funding opportunities up to this point. In addition, the UM System has made $260M available for strategic initiatives, in alignment with the Compacts, for the System universities to request through a proposal process with university matching requirements.

The new strategic plan has very ambitious goals. Open forum discussions indicate that the goals are obtainable due to the new budget model and the data-driven decision making culture. The budget model has been transformed to provide flexibility to invest in strategic initiatives. In addition, UMSL has the opportunity to request additional funding for strategic initiatives from the UM system, as previously indicated. Based on this, evidence suggests that UMSL has the resources necessary to achieve the new strategic plan.

State funding was reduced somewhat by the state budget reductions of 1.2% for FY19, but executive leadership believes the state finances are relatively stable. However, if a modest decline in enrollment or state allocations were to occur, UMSL appears to have the flexibility and infrastructure to adapt.

Evidence indicates that UMSL has developed new ways to help manage the budget, increase accountability, and evaluate financial performance. The institution has a five-year budget, an annual budget and a monthly budget evaluation process. The process reviews the budgetary status of each unit as well as the university overall every month and updates the annual and five-year budgets to reflect the changes. Finance and Administration has developed new tools to better understand the financial performance of the campus at all levels. The UMSL Fingerprint Model uses cost per class (actual instructor cost) and net revenue per student to understand margins by class. Revenue and cost at each level of the organization are used to develop reporting of margins at the department level, college level, campus costs (administration, facilities, etc.), including the cost of buildings (depreciation expenses).

In 2018, UMSL made additional changes with respect to the financial/business operations support structure by changing duties of the college and unit financial support staff to business managers reporting to the CFO. In speaking with the Deans, this change has been a positive experience with

little to no disruption of service. In speaking with the business managers, they feel better trained and prepared for their jobs with greater collaboration. The business managers and deans generally seem pleased with the change. All reported improved channels of communication from department level through to the CFO and back again.

System information has been put into place providing Deans, Directors, and managers with financial information they did not previously have access to. UMSL has incorporated a decision model to develop accountability and delegation of hiring decisions to operational budget leaders and their business managers. This procedure ensures better alignment between organizational decisions, strategies, and financial plans. Along with managing a change in culture that emphasizes sound financial management, these changes are improving the campus' profitability. Deans all indicated that they had the information they needed to make strategic financial decisions for their unit and all felt adequately funded to meet their operational needs.

The university employs 873 faculty members to deliver its programs: 259 tenured or tenure track, 198 non-tenure track, and 416 adjunct. The student-faculty ratio of 17.9:1 is lower than the average of the UM System. UMSL maintains a distribution of academic ranks with less than a 2:1 ratio between assistant professors (54) and associates (102) or full professors (103). In addition, there is a high correlation between full-time faculty assigned to units and majors and credit hour production in the units, indicating that allocation of human resources is appropriate based on the demonstrable needs of the unit. The Provost and Deans indicate that student demand is being met, that course wait-lists are monitored, and that resources are available to open new sections as needed.

The evidence provided by UMSL demonstrates that the institution's staff are appropriately qualified and trained. Human Resources has developed a Management Guide for the Hiring Process which outlines how to define a position, as well as best practices for recruitment, screening, and interviews. According to the Assurance Argument and subsequent interviews, Human Resources is responsible for recruitment and applicant screening for all staff positions. Qualified candidates are forwarded by Human Resources to the hiring department. Once the department management selects a candidate, Human Resources conducts an equity review and makes a recommendation for the hiring salary.

UMSL has a new employee orientation along with a number of other resources online for efficient on-boarding. New manager training is conducted twice per year, and employees are required to complete annual compliance training online. There are also a number of continuing professional development opportunities available to employees including, but not limited to, training in procurement services, accounting services, business analysis, IT, leadership development, and Six Sigma. A search on the UMSL website for "training" produces a long list of training opportunities in a variety of areas including computer education, data visualization, canvas, SQL, a variety of applications, lab safety, and many more.

Evidence indicates that the University has adequate physical facilities to meet students' needs. According to a 2016 study of needs and space utilization, the physical facilities are more than sufficient to support operations. However, according to the study, there are a few specific areas that are inadequate or in need of attention while other areas had a surplus. For example, Nursing growth is limited by the classroom and lab space available, and the study suggests that more Library and student study spaces were needed. The 2018 Master Plan outlines a course of action to address these issues.

Based on an external space study conducted at UMSL and input from the campus community, UMSL has developed a 5-year capital plan which includes funding requirements. While the funding is not yet established, the strategic direction is established as donors or other funding is made available. Currently, the budget for this plan tentatively includes $46M from operations as well as state and

system funding over the next 6 years. However, this funding is not yet secured.

Evidence indicates that IT is regularly reviewing their operations and seeking to evolve to continue to meet the campus IT needs. According to the 2017 ITS five-year review, ITS has adequate funds to maintain current levels of service, and periodic large scale hardware refreshes or major initiatives have been and are possible. However, the review also indicates that staff is limited in most IT areas. In addition, hiring freezes and salary restrictions have resulted in difficulty in attracting and retaining top talent in ITS in the competitive St. Louis market. The review outlines a plan to incorporate fundamental operational changes that will make the unit more adept at supporting the institutional mission, such as increased reliance on shared services, less management of hardware infrastructure, and more emphasis on deployment of third-party software and services.

According to discussions with IT leadership, the UM system provides support for the enterprise applications. The UMSL ITS department is evolving to what it needs to be on the campus. They provide help desk, desktop, and ancillary application support (backend and interfaces). ITS has made a shift away from infrastructure such as phone lines and networking, and also from a charge back model, towards a shared services model through the use of relationship managers. A team has volunteered to go first for this shared services model, indicating acceptance of the new model by at least some members of the unit. The relationship managers will be focused more on communicating with the departments. UMSL is working with the Southern Illinois System to build an integrated academic portal, which is something the UM system is interested in replicating. Finally, ITS has moved away from separate departmental budgets and instead has one IT budget to support the unit as a whole. Interviews verified that these changes, combined with those of the budgetary model campus-wide, made budgets much more transparent, efficient and easier to understand.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies— including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

As indicated in the Assurance Argument and reflected in Board of Curators meeting minutes, the Curators interact with each campus and oversee those items relevant to UMSL. They meet regularly with UMSL constituents and are being informed about campus issues and initiatives. In fact, during the week following the Team visit, the Board is holding one of its regular meetings at UMSL (Thursday and Friday), immediately preceded by a UM System research symposium involving faculty on Wednesday.

A review of Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) meeting minutes shows that IFC is directly interacting with the System President and officers and Curators, and is being informed by strategies and plans for the system. Based on minutes from its September 2018 meeting, IFC learned about strategies being developed for supporting research on all campuses.

Discussions with members of the Faculty Senate support the Assurance Argument. The IFC provides monthly updates to the Faculty Senate, which then takes back to the System-level the Faculty's Senate input. The System has strong leadership which advocates successfully for the System with state legislators. Due to this strong advocacy, the System still has its own pension system that supports UMSL's workforce.

The governance policies and procedures, and the relationship between those at the System level with those at UMSL, are well understood as documented in the Assurance Argument and supported by discussions with campus stakeholders. For example, the new budgetary process was well articulated by campus members during the open forum discussions. UMSL's new five-year budget plan was well received by the System. Currently, discussions are taking place at the System level as to how UMSL's budgeting model can be adopted at the other campuses. Similarly, UMSL's new IT relationship managers model serves as a model for the System. Finally, the System's governance processes allow UMSL constituents to participate in decision-making.

Discussion with President Choi and a review of minutes from IFC indicate that changes taking place at the System level are supporting UMSL's mission and strengthening its work through: consolidations under System of common services such as HR, IT, finance, and communication; increased partnerships and sharing of courses among the System's institutions; and providing research support and encouraging research collaboration. For example, UMSL is leading a collaborative $30 million opioid research project in partnership with Washington University in St. Louis and other UM System institutions.

The Assurance Argument, the open forum and criteria discussions with UMSL faculty and staff, and a review of UMSL websites all indicate that the institution has an established and well understood structure of rules, regulations, and committee participation to provide opportunities for shared governance. The governance system is very strong as evidenced by the Faculty Senate which meets monthly and has 24 committees involving 40% of the faculty. As a result of an EAB analysis of best practices in faculty governance, a process is underway to streamline the work the Faculty Senate by reducing the number of committees. Additional evidence of governance in action were identified through discussions with UMSL community members. For example, during his tenure, the Chancellor eliminated several proposed student fees based on student recommendations provided through the governance system, e.g. supplemental course fees in Theater and Arts.

The Faculty Senate committee meetings are open to all campus members. Faculty members indicated that they attend the Budget and Planning committee meetings on a regular basis for informational purposes. The University Assembly meets every other month and works collaboratively with the Faculty Senate. There are currently 15 students on the University Assembly and two students on each committee, with the students having voting rights. The Intercampus Councils provide voice for faculty, staff, and students at the System level. The Student Government association has a strong voice, as evidenced by the building of the Recreation and Wellness Center which was a student led initiative. Overall, the work of these entities is transparent with agendas and minutes posted on the website.

Faculty Senate's program review documents and discussions with campus community members indicate that there is evidence of a strong collaborative process among various units on campus. For example, the College of Nursing is collaborating with the Student Affairs' Care Team to address the needs of Nursing students. As a result of this collaboration and of the training offered by the Care Team to the campus community on homelessness language, a student who is homeless was identified and within a week the student was offered financial support.

Finally, UMSL has a strong practice of five year reviews of campus units as evidenced through discussions with community members and a review of university's websites and IR records. The reviews are not perfunctory and the recommendations are being followed up. In the context of governance, the 2011 Faculty Senate program review identified that efforts were needed to diversify the leadership positions for Senate and Assembly committees and to attract a broader range of participants for committee activities, including non-tenure track faculty. Subsequently, Faculty Senate meeting minutes indicate the efforts to diversify were successful as evidenced by an increase in number of non-tenure track faculty serving on and chairing committees.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Evidence demonstrates that the institution makes investments and re-aligns budgetary allocations to support its strategic plan and core values. APP analyzed UMSL's academic programs to help guide future distribution of resources. The March 2018 APP report provides recommendations for budget re-allocations for academic programs. For example, investments in Cybersecurity and computer technology programs were made, and a new grant writer was hired in the Office of Research Administration (ORA). In addition, to support the needs of the student population, a campus wide initiative was implemented to provide funding for hiring upper level undergraduate students to provide tutoring to other students.

There is substantial evidence of UMSL's allocation of resources based on its priorities: the creation of a new Associate Provost for Student Success position; investment in accelerated programs such as an interdisciplinary entrepreneurial certificate; non-curricular student clubs; internships with startup companies; and increased scholarships and grants that target both financially challenged and historically underrepresented students. These and other examples were evidenced in the Assurance Argument and supported by open forum and Criteria discussions.

Campus interviews indicate that data-driven decision making is part of the institution's culture, verifying what the Team learned from the Assurance Argument. To increase efficiencies, ORA was merged with the Graduate School in 2016. Similarly, the College of Fine Arts and Communication was moved back into the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and Studio Art, Art History, Music, Theater and Dance become the School of Fine and Performing Arts under CAS. Similarly, Student Affairs leadership explained how data provided by surveys such as NSSE and BCSSE resulted in a redesign of student orientations, enhanced their work with student leadership, and led to increased resources for professional development of staff who advise and work with students.

The Faculty Senate and University Assembly's Budget and Planning (B&P) Committee plays a pivotal role in connecting all institutional areas and leading discussions on planning, budgeting and resource prioritization and re-allocation as indicated in the Assurance Argument and validated through discussions with campus members. The B&P Committee will oversee and monitor the implementation of the APP recommendations. In addition, the central budgeting system allows for strategic investments and re-allocations consistent with the new mission and vision. The budgeting process has resulted in UMSL having a stronger balance sheet due to the use of metrics that are reviewed on a regular basis.

Five-year review reports including assessment of student learning are conducted for all academic and service units. The Provost and the Provost's Council produce formative reports each semester on degree conferral and general program accountability. A summative report is due at the end of each summer which is reviewed by vice chancellors and vice provosts. The Provost has included the Budget and Planning (B&P) Committee in discussions of the strategic plan developed in 2017-18, and in the 2018 Academic Program Prioritization process. B&P works with the Chancellor, Provost, CFO, and other administrators to monitor progress toward goal attainment, to coordinate planning, and to review and endorse the university budget and related financial decisions. Finally, via discussions with campus leaders the Team learned that UMSL will use "Achieve It" to track the progression and implementation of the strategic plan's goals. This information will support the budgetary realignment process.

The strategic planning website indicates a timeline and process which incorporates input from the campus community through open forums and committees with broad representation. Discussions with members of the five Compacts and strategic planning group indicate that the process was intense, yet transparent, with community members having numerous opportunities to provide input. The 2018-2023 strategic plan was initiated by the System's new president, Dr. Choi. It was developed in parallel with the strategic plans of the other three system institutions. The development of the strategic plan did not take into consideration the outcomes of the previous strategic plan. The 2014-2018 was initiated by the previous President of the system and its focus was strictly on enrollment growth, whereas the current plan is much more comprehensive and far-reaching with realizable goals.

Discussion with campus members indicate that UMSL has a good understanding of changes in its student population. UMSL has a heavy reliance on transfer students (75% of new undergraduate students), and has seen a decline in first-time freshman and in the number of Missouri resident students. The institution looks at enrollment trends by socio-economic-demographic sub-populations of students on a regular basis, and the data are being analyzed and used in the decision-making process.

Both the assurance argument and the campus leadership indicate that enrollment data have driven the development of strategic goals and targets. One of the impacts of changes in enrollment led to the creation of the Associate Provost for Student Success position to enhance the emphasis on student retention, the complementary component of recruiting in enrollment management. Investments in UMSL NOW (Night, Online and Weekend) programs is an example of adapting academic programming to student demographics shifts and to changes in students' needs. Another example is the collaboration with the Southern Illinois University system and the extension of in-state tuition to Illinois residents.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

It is very apparent that UMSL develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations for external and internal accounting purposes as well as operational improvements. In 2015, the state legislature implemented a performance funding model in which at least 90 percent of any increase in the core funding for a public institution would depend on demonstrable success on performance measures adopted by the state. These performance measures, based on the recommendations of the Council on Public Higher Education (COPHE), included measures of student success and performance, increased degree attainment, quality of student learning, financial responsibility and efficiency, a mission-specific measure, and graduate outcomes. Performance indicators directly related to the state model (e.g., freshman-sophomore retention rates, six-year cohort graduation rates, and professional and occupational licensure test success rates) are tracked and reported by Institutional Research. The university aggregates these data and other performance/outcome measures into an annual report that is submitted to the UM System.

As discussed previously, UMSL conducts five-year reviews of academic and non-academic units. An overview of the process, procedures, guidelines, schedules, timelines, and other resources is available through IR and indicate a comprehensive process covering the majority of operational and academic areas on campus. Each review includes an external expert and a campus review team composed of faculty, staff, or administrators who review the self-study and meet with stakeholders as part of the process. Many examples of changes made in response to these reviews indicate that UMSL follows a lessons-learned approach to continuous improvement.

Evidence in the field suggests that UMSL administration as well as faculty and staff learned much from their financial difficulties and the resulting process to realign the budget. The campus community worked together as a team using data and input from stakeholders to evaluate and determine ways to adjust expenditures and/or grow revenues. Then, the campus worked together to redesign the budget model. The revised model provides more funding centrally allowing for the University to respond to budgetary reductions more quickly and providing an opportunity to invest in strategic initiatives. Representatives from Faculty Senate indicated that significant value was placed on the input from faculty, staff, and students with decisions changed or modified as a result of their input. Faculty and staff expressed pride in this accomplishment.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

The UMSL Assurance Argument, additional documents and websites reviewed, and on-campus interviews all provide evidence that the institution has sufficient resources, structures, and processes to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. Further evidence indicates that UMSL plans strategically for the future. While the budget model and restructuring of business functions are new, they appear to be functioning effectively, and the ongoing program review process is robust. Based on all available evidence, the institution meets Criterion 5.

The team recommends that UMSL pursue additional opportunities for funding by investigating the allocation formula for the state and UM System, and by submitting proposals to the UM System Strategic Investment Program in areas where there is alignment with the UMSL strategic plan. In addition, although the 5-year budget adjusts for monthly changes, it could be further developed to reflect planned future investments and re-allocations.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Conclusion

UMSL has provided a convincing argument with sufficient data to demonstrate it adheres to federal compliance guidelines and that it meets all HLC Core Components, and therefore all Criteria for Accreditation. UMSL is a vital anchor institution to the St. Louis, MO region and the successful implementation of its strategic plan should maintain that status for years to come.

UMSL is currently an Open Pathway institution and has not undergone dynamic change or raised concerns that have required extensive HLC monitoring. This comprehensive evaluation Team is also not recommending any HLC follow up, thus UMSL does not meet the conditions for placement onto the Standard Pathway. Therefore, the Team recommends that UMSL be permitted to choose its Pathway.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation
Met

Sanctions Recommendation
No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation
Eligible to choose

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

FORM

Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the *Federal Compliance Overview* for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the team report.

Submission Instructions
Federal Compliance reviewer: Email this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* in an editable format to the team chair. The team chair's email address is provided in the Assurance System.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the HLC staff liaison for review and then to the institution for corrections of errors of fact. Submit the final worksheets to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review: University of Missouri - Saint Louis

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

☒ Evaluation team

☒ Federal Compliance reviewer

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 1

To be completed by the evaluation team chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Rex D. Ramsier

☒ I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition
(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*. Submit the completed worksheet with this form.

   - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:

     o Associate's degrees = 60 hours

     o Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours

     o Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree

   - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.

   - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.

   - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.

2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The University of Missouri – Saint Louis (UMSL) stated program lengths are consistent with the minimum number of credit hours (units). Bachelor degrees (120), Master degrees (30) and Doctoral degrees (60) hours (units). UMSL addressed differences in tuition rates for specific programs which are approved by the Board of Curators on an annual basis. Semester hour definitions, course numbering, and tuition costs were reviewed and verified in the University Bulletins provided in Appendixes A & B.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 2

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Institutional Records of Student Complaints
(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

   - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.

   - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.

   - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.

   - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.

   - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

University of Missouri – Saint. Louis provides access to student policies relating to Academic Integrity (p.648), Student Conduct & Title IX (p.649), UMSL Anti-Hazing Policy (p.654) and Sex Discrimination – Harassment and Sexual Misconduct (p.656) in the University Bulletin 2018-2019. A Student Toolkit is accessible for students online providing definitions and reporting opportunities at: http://www.umsl.edu/title-ix/studenttoolkit.html Complaints can also be filed/reported to the Title IX Coordinator.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 3

As one of the campuses of the University of Missouri System, UMSL follows the Anti-Discrimination policies and processes for resolving complaints. The University of Missouri System policies and procedures were reviewed at:
https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/equal_employment_educational_opportunity/ch600/600.060_equity_resolution_process_for_resolving_complaints

A review of the data presented in Appendix C – Harassment/Discrimination & General Complaints verified that evidence is collected. The University uses these findings to assess the student climate on campus. Utilizing the results have also encouraged the creation of a student advocate and including students in campus forums and town halls meetings. Faculty and administration have identified best practices for orientations and training workshops.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Publication of Transfer Policies
(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

    - Review the institution's transfer policies.

    - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.

    - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

    - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.

    - Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 4

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Transfer policies were reviewed and verified in Appendix D. They are published in the Undergraduate Study section of UMSL's Bulletin (p.10). Students can gain access to transfer information in several locations on the universities web site at the universities Office of Transfer Services at: http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices and the following subpages offer transfer tools and guides.

The Missouri articulation agreement among public institutions governs transfer of credit to UMSL from colleges and universities within the state of Missouri. The Office of Transfer Services offer quick links to college and program agreements. Students have access to Missouri Reverse Transfer information at: http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/files/pdfs/MRT%20Policy%20Sept%205%202013.pdf

A review of Appendixes E & F verified that the university has appropriate processes to align transfer policies with program decisions made within the institution. Appendix F provided a detailed checklist outlining the partnerships with institutions that are currently in process.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Practices for Verification of Student Identity
(See FCFI Questions 11−16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.

   - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.

   - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 5

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Student verification is handled at UMSL during the admissions process. Students have access to an online enrollment form which asks for their login and password. Online students are verified through a single sign on process with a two-step authentication.

Extra fees are clearly stated in the Universities Bulletin and are published on the website under the cashiers section. Additional costs for fully online, partially on-line, and blended courses were provided. The university does not offer correspondence courses.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Title IV Program Responsibilities
(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.

   • The team should verify that the following requirements are met:

      o **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.

      o **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)

      o **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 6

that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.

- o **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.

- o **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

- o **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

- o **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- o **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 7

- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.

- If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.

- If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity *(Core Components 2.A and 2.B)*.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

- General Program Requirements – University of Missouri System Single Audit Reports and the Department of Education documents were presented for review. It was verified that UMSL's Title IV Recertification was March 3, 2017 and the most recent Program Review was January 5, 2016. No fines or limitations were extended. The university addressed the Department's recommendations and has fulfilled all responsibilities.

- Financial Responsibilities – University of Missouri System Single Audit reports were presented for evidence pertaining to composite ratios and finances. A review of UMSL's Institutional Update Survey's and Financial Indicators documents in HLC's evidence file also verified that has a "clean audit".

  UMSL's Composite Financial Index for 2015-2017

  FY 2017   2.43

  FY 2016   2.10

  FY 2015   0.29

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 8

- Default Rates – Default rates were provided. No concerns have been raised by the Department of Education. UMSL does not participate in private loan programs.

  Year 1   6.7 %

  Year 2   7.4 %

  Year 3   7.6%

- Campus Crime – A number of offices within UMSL are responsible for ensuring that disclosures are compiled for consumer information; such as Athletics, Institutional Research, Institutional Safety and Campus Police and Registration.

  Policies and processes are in place to guarantee compliance with Title IV regulations. Campus security policies and crime statistics & crime log can be accessed at: http://safety.umsl.edu/police/form%20and%20policy/index.html

- Students Right to Know – Information and disclosures are listed in a number of links within the registration section published on the universities website located at: http://www.umsl.edu/~registration/students/studentconsumer.html

  IPEDS data, UMSL Fact Book, Graduation Rate Tables were presented and reviewed in Appendix N. The university has demonstrated that no federal investigation or findings from the Department of Education has been raised.

- Academic Progress & Attendance – UMSL's bulletin provides access to student absence policies under the Academic Affairs division. Student absence policies were also reviewed in the sampling of course syllabi. Cost of attendance, tuition & fees and academic progress are available to students on the financial aid website. The university had demonstrated that that the policies and information provided meet federal and state requirements.

- Contractual Relations - NA

- Consortial Relations - NA

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Required Information for Students and the Public
(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 9

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

University of Missouri – Saint Louis publishes accurate and timely information regarding programs, fees, and policies. Student and the general public can view UMSL's graduate and undergraduate bulletin online, handbooks, welcome information and new student program information which can be found at UMSL's bulletin website at: http://bulletin.umsl.edu or at http://umsl.edu/newstudentprograms. The university offers families a monthly newsletter encouraging activities to be shared with students. Reviewed and verified at: http://umsl.edu/newstudentprograms/Parent%20and%20Family%20Programs%20/index.html

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information
(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

   - Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC's web address.

   - Review the institution's disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.

   - Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.

   - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 10

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

A review of the information provided by UMSL verified the university provides accurate and timely information to current and prospective students and to the public good regarding its accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission and other accrediting bodies. Accreditation information is provided for consumer information at: http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/index.html

A review of documentation provided in Appendices U-X highlighted the relationships that UMSL shares with specialized accrediting bodies and the many opportunities programs have to examine their quality assurances for student success. Students and staff have an opportunity to reflect on the "good standing" of the programs in the list of Accrediting Organizations and Program Approvals in the UMSL Fact Book (Appendix X).

UMSL correctly displays the Mark of Afflation on its website and publically links to the Higher Commission.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Review of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.

    • Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.

    • Review the institution's explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

    ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

    ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 11

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The University System Office of Institutional Research supports UMSL's data collection. The Office of Institutional Research provides student outcome data in such areas as; Graduation rates, Retention rates, Performance gaps, and Capstone/Major field tests. The reports are available for strategic planning, academic decisions, and for 5 year program reviews. The Systems Board of Curators has also directed the Universities to assess student outcomes in two required areas. (1) Test general education incoming freshmen and graduating seniors and (2) to have a capstone project/major field test.

University of Missouri – Saint Louis Office of the Registrar provides access to current and archived enrollment summaries which are accessible to the public in excel documents. These were reviewed and verified.

The university acknowledges the use of the College Scorecard and noted the student loan repayment is 60% vs the national average is 47%. The university uses the data collected for such decisions as strategic planning, etc.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Publication of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.

    - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution's website—for instance, linked to from the institution's home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.

    - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

    ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

    ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 12

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Student Consumer Information can be found on the university's website at: https://www.umsl.edu/~registration/students/studentconsumer.html. The Office of the Registrar is committed to providing services that include processes relating to academic records, enrollment data, academic certification, etc. while upholding the institution's academic policies and adhering to state and federal regulations.

UMSL offers a Fact Book on the university's website at: https://www.umsl.edu/~ir/Fact%20Book/index.html which gives tables, graphs and data relating to a number of topics such as; Program Review data, Degrees and Alumni and an IR Share Point login.

The Institutional Research department at the University and within the System offers a wide range of statistics for institutional, program, and student decision making.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies
(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

   The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

   Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

   - Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 13

- Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.

- Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

A review and evaluation of the documentation provided in Appendices U-X verified that UMSL is in "good standing" with other specialized accrediting bodies. A list of the Accrediting Organizations and Program Approvals in the UMSL Fact Book (Appendix X).

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment
(FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

   Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

   - Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution's notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

   - Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 14

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The UMSL Student Opinion Survey Results 2018 were available in the evidence file of the assurance area. An evaluation of the categories determined students were satisfied with the services at UMSL except the financial aid counseling which was slightly lower (2.98) than the other categories. Students also noted a few comments relating to the unresponsiveness of the financial aid office. Just as surveys offer a benefit to explore opinions of the services being offered, the university has an opportunity to determine what the desirable benchmarks are for the results.

The university complies with public disclosures by requesting 3rd party comments which was reviewed and verified in Appendices T – Y. Open forums and announcements were provided to gain feedback. The upcoming higher learning commission visit was posted on the universities website.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement
(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)

   - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.

   - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 15

- Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Not Applicable

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

Documents reviewed

Institutional Status & Requirement Report – 2018

UMSL Student Opinion Survey Results

Institutional Updates for 2013-2014, 2015-2016, 2016-2017

Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Essential Elements of Course Syllabus

Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) F2F Syllabus Template

Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Online Syllabus

Faculty Resources Guide 2018-2019

Table – Graduation Rates Degree Seeking Undergraduates

IPEDS Data

UUMSL Fact Book – Athletics Document

Equity in Athletics 2017

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 16

Appendixes reviewed

Appendix A	Assignment of Credit Hours
Appendix A1	Credit Hour Allocation
Appendix A2	Course Numbering & Credit Hour Definition - University Bulletin 2018-2019
Appendix B 1 & 2	UMSL University Bulletin – Under Graduate & Graduate
Appendix B3	Class Offerings
Appendix C	Harassment/Discrimination & General Complaints Data
Appendix D	UMSL University Bulletin – Transfer Policies
Appendix E	List of Agreements & Links
Appendix F	Domestic Institution Partnership Process Checklist
Appendix G	UMSL University Bulletin – Tuition & Fees
Appendix H	University of Missouri System Single Audit Reports
Appendix I	Department of Education Documents
Appendix J	University of Missouri System Single Audit Reports
Appendix M	Campus Crime Documentation
Appendix N	Right to Know Information – List of UMSL's Links, IPEDS Data, Fact Book
Appendix O	Academic Progress & Student Absence Policy
Appendices R & S	Required Advertising Information for Students & Public
Appendix T	HLC Accreditation Information 2018
Appendix U	NACAC Information
Appendix V	Student Outcome Data
Appendix W	Other Accrediting Bodies Documents
Appendix X	Fact Book – List of Accrediting Organizations and Approvals
Appendix Y	UMSL Seeking Public Feedback

Web pages reviewed

http://www.umsl.edu

http://www.umsl.edu/title-ix/studenttoolkit.html

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/equal_employment_educational_opportunity/ch600/600.060_equity_resolution_process_for_resolving_complaints

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 17

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/contact.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/how-to-transfer/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/how-to-transfer/transfer-admission-requirements.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/Transfer%20Guides/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/transcript-evaluations.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/transfer-tools/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/transferservices/files/pdfs/MRT%20Policy%20Sept%205%202013.pdf

http://www.umsl.edu/cashiers

http://www.umsl.edu~registration/students/studentconsumer.edu

http://www.umsl.edu/services/ctl

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/accreditation/index.html

http://www.umsl.edu/newstudentprograms

http://umsl.edu/newstudentprograms/Parent%20and%20Family%20Programs%20/index.html

https://www.umsl.edu/~ir/Fact%20Book/index.html

http://safety.umsl.edu/police/form%20and%20policy/index.html

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 18

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: University of Missouri - Saint Louis

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions
Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses
A.   Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

    ☒ Yes   ☐ No

    Comments:

    The University of Missouri – Saint Louis (UMSL) calendar lengths and definitions of credit hours (units) were reviewed and verified. Calendars and schedules are published in the UMSL undergraduate and graduate bulletin (2018-2019). A review of the Office of the Registrar website also included definitions for mode of delivery and scheduling resources which is located at: http://www.umsl.edu/~registration/scheduling-resources/

    Course schedules and program definitions are presented to students in a timely fashion enabling students to determine if they want to choose a course for 8 weeks, 16 weeks, blended or fully online to fit their educational needs (UMSL Bulletin p. 4-7).

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 1

B.   Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Rationale:

The University meets expectations for good practices regarding the calendar and term lengths.

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

None

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team's review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.

2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).

   - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.

   - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)

   - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 2

- Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.

4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.

   - For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

   - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.

   - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.

   - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.

5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.

6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:

   - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?

   - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?

   - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 3

learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?

- Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?

- Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?

7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:

- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.

- If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.

- If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours
A.   Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

Semester Classroom Courses

3402 Financial Accounting – 3 cr. #12756

4300 Community Health Nursing – 4 cr. #10066

1005 Intro to Biological Anthropology – 4 cr. #13046

1001 Arabic I – 5 cr. #13901

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 4

4902 Ethics, Values and Policy in Population Health – 6 cr. #15435

2290 Special Study – Arranged 1 – 10 cr. #12594

<u>8 Week Courses</u>

1000 Effective Communication for College – 3 cr. 12915

1030 Democracy & War – 3 cr. #15322

5100 Managerial Communication – 3 cr. #14428

<u>Online Courses & Partially Online Courses</u>

1019 Intro to Archaeology – 3 cr. #13043

1011 Planets & Life in the Universe – 3 cr. #13657

2400 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting – 3 cr. #12744

3804 Ethical & Legal Dimensions of Nursing Practice – 3 cr. #12412

6412 Philosophical Foundations of Adult Ed – 3 cr. #15650

1001 Elementary Meteorology – 4 cr. #13651

6737 Psychiatric – Mental Health – 4/5 cr. #12394

University of Missouri – Saint Louis is approved for distance education courses and programs and notification approval for changes in locations.

B.   Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

    a. Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

    ☒ Yes   ☐ No

    Comments:

    Credit hour and student contact minutes are defined in UMSL's undergraduate bulletin (p.18). Classroom/lab student contact minutes per credit were reviewed and verified. The Center for Teaching and Learning Essential Elements of Course Syllabus also addresses time requirements for student contact.

    b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 5

☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

A review of UMSL's Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) Online Syllabus Template and the sampled online course syllabi identified that time requirements were stated clearly for an online course. Faculty may use language that defines contact time per credit and homework time that is typically expected of a student. Links to An Online Readiness Survey encourages students to decide if they are ready to take an online course vs a classroom setting.

c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

The University's Center for Teaching & Learning Syllabus Template offers a rubric for grading discussion boards and helps the faculty and students understand that participation in discussion boards, chat rooms, and communication venues are expected for student success. Course policies listed give clear messages relating to course requirements and standards for coursework and behavior.

d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

University of Missouri – Saint Louis is a public university within the University of Missouri System. Collected Rules & Regulations address the credit hour definition. UMSL adheres to the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the Missouri Department of Education with various initiatives such as Missouri Reverse Transfer. Reviewed at: (https://dhe.mo.gov/policies/credit-transfer.php)

2. Application of Policies

a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☒ Yes ☐ No

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 6

Comments:

Review of UMSL's Center for Teaching resources for faculty outlined suggestions for developing face to face and online courses in the Course Syllabus Guidelines as well as templates are provided to aide in consistency and essential delivery formats slated for student success. CTL's Essential Elements of Course Syllabus document was reviewed and verified that credit requirements are met.

An evaluation of the Faculty Resource Guide 2018-2019 verified policy and procedure information is accessible to faculty. The Guide and other resources can be found on the UMSL Center for Teaching website at:
http://www.umsl.edu/services/ctl/files/pdfs/FRG%20PDFs/FacultyResourceGuide.pdf

b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Sample course syllabi were reviewed. All syllabi had course descriptions consistent with UMSL's Bulletin. A majority of the syllabi stated learning outcomes for the course. The learning outcomes were presented in a number of ways with headings; such as, Goals, Course Outcomes, This Course should… and Learning Objectives.   The sample syllabus templates provided through the Center for Teaching and Learning resources for faculty does offer a heading of Goals (aka Learning Outcomes) of the Course.

c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Course descriptions are consistent with UMSL's Bulletin. When developing a syllabus faculty are asked to retrieve the course description from the University Bulletin .via a link to the website and supplement the description with examples of course content and learning methodologies.

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

A sampling of 8 week, partially online, fully online, and face to face courses was evaluated. Learning outcomes were identified in a majority of the courses reviewed. Various headings and language was used to lead the student to the learning outcomes of the course. It did appear that the learning outcomes reviewed were appropriate for the courses and programs, however, encouraging the use of the CTL template(s) would benefit student success and encourage consistency of language being used.

e. Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Programs are within range of acceptable practice in higher education.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Rationale:

University of Missouri – Saint Louis meets required credit hour policies and practices.

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

None

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Identify the findings:

None

Rationale:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 8

None

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

> Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

If the answer is "Yes," complete the "Worksheet on Clock Hours."

Note: This worksheet is <u>not</u> intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution's overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student's work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

> Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):
>
> 1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
> 1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction
>
> Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution's requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours
A.   Answer the Following Questions

> 1. Does the institution's credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 9

Comments:

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

3. Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 10

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	University of Missouri-Saint Louis, MO
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Open Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	Comprehensive evaluation includes a Federal Compliance reviewer: Dr. Lynette Olson.
DATES OF REVIEW:	11/5/2018 - 11/6/2018

☐ No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: no change

Degrees Awarded: Bachelors, Masters, Specialist, Doctors

Recommended Change: no change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2008 - 2009

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2018 - 2019

Recommended Change: 2028-2029

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior Commission approval is required for substantive change as stated in Commission policy.

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Location:

The institution has been approved for the Notification Program, allowing the institution to open new additional locations within the United States.

Recommended Change: no change

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: no change

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway   Open Pathway

Recommended Change: no change

Upcoming Events

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change: no change

Institutional Data

Educational Programs		**Recommended Change:**
Undergraduate		
Certificate	84	_____
Associate Degrees	0	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	48	_____
Graduate		
Master's Degrees	32	_____
Specialist Degrees	2	_____
Doctoral Degrees	13	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Locations

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Jefferson College, 1000 Viking Dr, Hillsboro, MO, 63050 - Active

Mineral Area College, 5270 Flat River Dr, Park Hills, MO, 63601 - Active

Missouri Baptist Medical Center, 3015 N. Ballas Rd, St. Louis, MO, 63131 - Active

South County, 4115 Meramec Bottom Rd, St. Louis, MO, 63129 - Active

St Louis Community College-Wildwood, 2645 Generations Dr, Wildwood, MO, 63040-1168 - Active

St. Charles Community College, 4601 Mid Rivers Mall Dr, St. Charles, MO, 63376 - Active

STLCC - Meramec, 11333 Big Bend Rd, St. Louis, MO, 63122 - Active

West County Continuing Education Center, 12837 Flushing Meadows Dr., St Louis, MO, 63131 - Active

Recommended Change: no change

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: no change

Distance Delivery

09.0101 - Speech Communication and Rhetoric, Bachelor, BA in Communication

09.0102 - Mass Communication/Media Studies, Bachelor, BS in Media Studies

13.0401 - Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Master, MEd in Adult Education

13.1001 - Special Education and Teaching, General, Master, MEd in Special Education

13.1202 - Elementary Education and Teaching, Master, MEd in Elementary Education

13.1401 - Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language/ESL Language Instructor, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Bachelor, BLS in Liberal Studies

30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Bachelor, Interdisciplinary Studies

30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Bachelor, Interdisciplinary Studies

38.0101 - Philosophy, Bachelor, BA in Philosophy

43.0199 - Corrections and Criminal Justice, Other, Bachelor, BS in Criminology & Criminal Justice

45.1101 - Sociology, Bachelor, BA/BS in Sociology

51.3801 - Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse, Bachelor, BSN

51.3801 - Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse, Master, MSN in Nursing

51.3803 - Adult Health Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Post MSN Adult Nursing Practitioner

51.3805 - Family Practice Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Post MSN Family Nurse Practitioner

51.3808 - Nursing Science, Doctor, PhD in Nursing

51.3809 - Pediatric Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Pst MSN Pediatric Nurse Practitioner

51.3818 - Nursing Practice, Doctor, DNP in Nursing

51.3822 - Women's Health Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Pst MSN Women's Health Nurse Practitioner

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

51.3899 - Registered Nursing, Nursing Administration, Nursing Research and Clinical Nursing, Other, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Pst MSN Nurse Practitioner

52.0101 - Business/Commerce, General, Bachelor, BSBA in Business Administration

52.0101 - Business/Commerce, General, Master, MBA

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: no change

Consortial Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: no change